

Urban Forestry Commission (UFC)

August 1, 2012

Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower Room 2750
700 5th Avenue, Seattle
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

Attending

Commissioners

Matt Mega (MM) – chair

John Small (JS)

Tom Early (TE)

John Floberg (JF)

Peg Staeheli (PS)

Absent- Excused

Nancy Bird (NB)

Gordon Bradley (GB)

Leif Fixen (LF)

Jeff Reibman (JR)

Staff

Sandra Pinto de Bader - OSE

Jana Dilley - SPU

Mark Mead - Parks

Guest speakers

Joanna Nelson de Flores - Forterra

Evelyn Hull – GSP Forest Steward

Public

John O’Neil – Seattle Prep

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Call to Order

Public comment

John O’Neil – Seattle Prep is selling a 2 acres piece of land. In the past they looked at putting parking there. Changed current master plan to include parking on site so that property is currently surplus. Has steep slope. They have discussed with the State as access to 520 and the bike lane. Suggested Seattle Prep property and had discussions with the State about it. State design moves toward including the property for a better solution. State switched to original design and not using Prep property. He thinks it should be part of the public domain. Safe routes to school, the property can be used to meet that requirement. State has agreement with neighborhoods for the stuff under 520 needs to be designed according to crime prevention. Putting the connector under 520 does not meet the spirit of the agreement. As the City addresses mitigation measures with the State we would like to suggest to use the Prep property as a form of mitigation to compensate for the loss of lake front access. They are doing wetland mitigation at Magnuson Park.

TE – has State given an explanation for why they changed the design?

John O – they wanted to put parking under 520 and swap the property. But that would not be a desirable situation. The latest comment is that if they purchase the Prep property it will require a revision to the EIS (they don't want that). July drawings changed. This represents a unique opportunity from the urban forestry point of view.

JS - would like to recuse himself if it's turning into a discussion.

Approval of July 11 and July 18 meeting notes

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the July 11 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the July 18 meeting notes as amended. The motion was seconded and carried.

Tree Ambassador Program update – Jana Dilley (SPU)

Jana – Thank you for the opportunity to give an update on the Tree Ambassador (TA) program. We are in second year of program, have 40 volunteers in 13 teams in 2 different cohorts. Putting together great tree walks – Seattle Center, Greenlake, Capitol Hill, finishing one in NE Seattle. Working on one at the zoo. If you want to look at them on the reLeaf website. A good resource for people. Our volunteers did planting demonstrations mulching events and tree care in Wallingford, had a table with information at the Maple Leaf social. Seattle Channel did a piece on the program. Good coverage. We have the new cohort starting to put together projects. Restoration of SDOT landscapes in West Seattle. 400 volunteer hours so far.

JS – what are the program outcomes?

Jana - Goal of the program is to train people to have good understanding of UF in residential areas and be a resource for their neighborhood. Empower TAs to take on different projects. Capture data around outreach tables, specific tree care projects,

JS – is the hope is to identify projects?

Jana – One TA did tree planting in her neighborhood. Cherry trees in bad shape and the space is such that it can accommodate larger trees.

Another example on the value of training people – Maple Leaf a car took out a tree. The issue came up in the Maple Leaf tree log. A TA got into the blog and explained the issue providing accurate information and was helpful to manage the tone of the dialogue.

MM – a lot of cool projects. Are you anticipating on having a website with a map showing where the TAs are.

JS – maybe same map GSP uses to show activity by TAs

PS – is there a place where we would find the distribution of the TAs.

Jana – the online presence is not where we would like it to be. We are a young program and are working on building the infrastructure.

PS – what’s the distribution in the city?

Jana – first year it was mostly in the north. This year is more balanced. We still have a lot of pockets, but we are growing the program well.

JS – do you have money to keep it going?

Jana – we are working on the grant as part of GSP appropriation expiring in June 2013. Program is partnership between City and Forterra. When grant expires we’ll look for replacement funding. We are getting a strong base put together and we’ll see how we will grow the program.

TE – what’s the trend for people signing up.

Jana – right now she only has two data points, but had more this year than last year.

MM – 2013 the money might be gone. Will there be a TA if no money comes in?

Jana – we have enough to do another cohort. Ringing more people on board, will we have the staff to support them?

MM – are you putting in more time supporting them than you expected to?

PS – are we clear on the expectations with the TA on how much time you have?

Jana – it goes back to putting the structure together. We have a list of things that we would like to put together. We are doing as much as we can right now and taking advantage of people’s interests.

JS – are you doing anything with pests?

Jana – it’s

TE – what areas are not represented?

Jana – would like to have representation in Seward Park, Rainier Valley, and NE area.

TE- nobody in industrial areas

Jana – focus is in residential areas

SPdB – introduced Phyllis Shulman from Councilmember Richard Conlin’s office.

Green Seattle Partnership briefing – GSP Management Team and Forest Steward

Joanna Nelson de Flores (Forterra), Mark Mead (Parks), Evelyn Hull (Forest Steward)

Joanna – last year came to brief you on the work that the GSP is doing and how the budget was doing. This program works on public forested park lands. Work has remained strong in spite of budget cuts.

Volunteer hours have continued high, continued to enroll new acres, developed 5-year strategic plan. We are here to let you know what the budget is looking like.

We have invited Evelyn Hull to give you a sense of the type of work this program supports. She works in three different parks.

Evelyn – when I started in the mid '80s. I live across a section of the Arboretum. I would remove blackberries and ivy and didn't know about GSP. When I retired it became forefront on my mind and took the training. Work in Washington Park and Arboretum. 1 ¾ acres area with 1 ½ acres in restoration with about 8 volunteers and spend around 24 hours a month. Harrison ridge greenbelt – acreage 5.5 acres and have 1.3 in restoration and spends 12 hrs/month there, the third location where she works is East Duwamish greenbelt, Trenton and 39th with 5 volunteers and spend around 25 hrs/month. 4.6 acres with 1.5 in restoration. It has a nest of Coopers hawks that comeback every year.

When they started they were getting emails asking what they were doing. The backtracked and introduced themselves to neighbors and what the goal was. Now neighborhood would like to see them continue to use as connection to Rainier Beach Light rail station. GSP has been amazing to them. They provide with chips, burlap, plants, crews to remove Holly, horse chestnut and Cherry laurel with herbicide (volunteers don't use it). 100% ivy cover. No seedlings only mature big leaf maples. When they were doing ivy removal. They did a survival ring around each tree. When they did it the bark of the trees came with it. The trees are dead.

People are looking at doing other activities. We improved their property values, we are removing garbage. We are putting together a neighborhood blog about this. Exchange emails several times a month. They contact her if they want advise on what to plant on their properties.

West of the light rail line. Around the south end of Beacon Hill.

She lives in Madison Valley but goes to Duwamish to work on restoration projects in other areas of the city.

Joanna – Evelyn is one example, we have 130 forest stewards. All this involvement adds up. People ask: if budgets are cut, do we need city money? There is a 2 to 1 match from community, you need the City funding to have the leverage from the community.

Forterra was involved from the beginning of the program in 2005. They promised to raise \$3M and have delivered to date. Forterra continues its involvement but not doing same level of fundraising. We are moving into this time where we are looking for long-term sustainable funding.

This program hits a lot of different targets: sustain and grow our canopy, , youth employment programs, education.

Goodwill has a program and are now working with GSP. Safety, bringing community members together.

Mark – original three goals of the GSP model of sustainability, restore 2,500 acres, build a community to support it and have long-term funding to support the program.

When we built the program is a culmination of work that started in 1984. WE did a lot of forecasting, how much will this cost. This is a proof of concept is working the way it's supposed to, got 78% of the budget and accomplished 78% of the goals. We are falling off because the money is falling off.

A hidden component is that the 2 x 1 leveraging is not just with volunteer hours. Average is \$20/hr we get 80K volunteer hours a year. The hidden part is that the seed money is an investment in the community and we are seen a match coming back from residents, who are going out to get neighborhood grants and then major partners (EarthCorps and Nature C) are matching the work they are doing for the city under contract and they are doing more work. That is the way the program was built. The actual modeling we did is working. How are we going to continue the level of investment from the community. There is the issue, how is the City going to fund at the \$1.5M/year at a minimum. Where is the funding going to come from?

In 2015 you start to see diminishing returns, because we won't be able to support the level of volunteers as funds diminish. After 2016 we'll only have \$500K, bring 10 new acres into the restoration process and maintain around 900 acres. Forest Stewards won't be there if we can't support them. We are already seeing attrition and we need to push recruitment. Lower funding levels are pushing completion date out.

The City is in a conundrum. \$31.5 M in investment so far is in jeopardy.

PS – can you translate that with some facts? How fast are you talking about for the land to deteriorate.

MM – it depends on the level of restoration done but it will be 2-3 years before it goes back to being re-infected.

JS – invasives keep on growing. After a certain threshold we never get ahead. It's an economic argument. Monitoring and Maintenance, how much?

Mark - \$1.4 in perpetuity. Parks current budget continues to go down. We are asking is 2% of the Parks budget to manage half the land owned by the department. Parks manages 20% of the canopy with 6 % of the land. It's a community-wide effort. Addressing the funding issues we are giving financials of restored forest vs. un-restored forest.

PS – why does that investment have value? Some people don't get the forest issue but they get the usable land issue. WE have to work the story differently.

JF – if choked by weeds, forested parklands are not usable.

PS – how much is money being spent in a pocket park?

JS – get recreation partners. It comes with set of compromises. Mount bike trails. A lot of restoration has been done for that. Mountain biking, running, and other recreation activities.

MM – Fig 3 if it we were getting sustainable funding by 2024 we would be in the sustainable maintenance mode?

Mark – We don't have the O&M portion here that will be growing. \$1.4M around 15 staff.

MM – we need to put money into the CIP but it's finite. Then we need O&M sustainable.

Mark – the community match was an intuitive part of the program, but we didn't talk about it. We can't add those grants to the figure. The City needs to invest \$3M to get \$6M. WE need to be able to support our volunteers. Can't work on steep slopes, don't apply herbicides, don't use chain saws. We pay for plant purchases. Herbicide application is not cheap. We are at capacity. Current staff is reaching fatigue. With 130 FS to bring the 2,500 acres into restoration we need three times as many FSs. You are talking about 350 people that need support and that takes staff time. Then there is recruitment and training. A lot of work outside of restoration. Seattle Parks Foundation is now our fiscal agent for the small grants. When we talk about the capital campaign we didn't talk about the actual dollar value invested by the community. The last thing is that we've run up against folks that have looked at the modeling we've done and the difference between a conifer forest vs. a deciduous forest. Our forest is falling apart. We lost 2% of our canopy from 2003 to 2007.

JF – the canopy cover in all other zones, you have reduction in canopy cover only in parks. If we look at the dollars invested by the GSP some people might think that it is wasted money.

Mark – this is a difficult argument to make in the face of funding needs by police and fire. Its hard to argue that trees are important. We are looking for help making the argument. WE've become the poster child in terms of research of why people volunteer to protect the forest. One hour of Parks labor for every 4 hours of volunteer work.

JF – what is your ask from the UFC

Joanna – we would like the UFC to support the GSP and sustainable funding.

JS – at what level?

Joanna - \$1.5M/year

SPdB – program requires \$3M/year, so it's \$1.5 M on top of the \$1.5 M of Parks.

Mark – We could weather the recession with \$1.5M/year but to get back to speed on the goal we need \$3M/year. Partnerships like Seattle Goodwill helps youth gain experience and work on GSP projects. We are investing staff time and are getting youth working.

PS – Forterra, what's your read of the region in general on this issue? Is there support? If we go high we have seed pocket outside City of Seattle.

Joanna – we have taken the Seattle model and are working with 5 other cities with same goals. Brought them all recently together. Kirkland, Kent, Everett, Tacoma, Redmond. For Forterra is about livability of our cities but on a more scientific side of things with seed source we are looking at this regionally.

PS – to deal with where we are in the economy, we need to tweak the story talk about green jobs, usability, livability. Who uses them when they are invaded and who uses them when they are cleaned up. The dollar value is insignificant and we are doing our messaging wrong. Story on human services, because it's not that much money.

JF – powerful stories come from Forest Stewards. Parks Levy went in part to GSP.

TE – talking about the economics, take the dollar figure and compare it to the total city-wide spending and use the city-wide canopy. Reallocating money within Parks but opening it up to a city-wide search. Look at community value but beyond Parks.

JS – another thing is to push SPU to do more quantitative analysis of top of the pipe solutions. Need data to support GSP which are cheaper than the gray solutions and more benefits than the vault.

JF – can't hug a vault

MM – timeline for support.

Joanna – This month would be great. There are conversations around including GSP funding in an SPU rate package.

JS – did we write a letter last year?

Mark – invitation to Shareholders meeting

Seattle's Forest Ecosystems Values report (i-Tree) comment letter – introduction and possible vote

JS – one piece of data interesting and to have frequently is health data. Instead of waiting for canopy to decline. Except for i-tree we have nothing.

MM – the expense is very high. What are the choices? Keep it general to be able to consider the tradeoffs.

Strengthen last paragraph.

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the letter with the suggested changes. The motion was seconded and carried.

UFMP and DPD tree ordinance comment letters – initial conversation

MM – I'd like to capture what we talked about with the Mayor

1. 24" threshold
2. Groves (health quality habitat)
3. No restriction on cutting under < 24"
4. Mitigation
5. Management structure (as part of UFM update?)

Also look at:

6. Green Factor
7. Tree credit system for development

Need to set up a working group to meet of line and discuss. How do you guys want to do it.

JF – what's the timeline?

MM – by October 1 in letter form with detail

PS – to streamline the letter can we do a cover letter and each of these becomes a header . We need to be able to crank this out.

TE – likes the cover letter idea. But all items are intertwined and the management part needs to be included in the letter.

PS – can get that done without getting into too much detail. Talk about a bigger problem than an ordinance.

JS- if they reject the management part will they reject the other issues?

MM – that's what we'll have to massage. Some things will have to be very specific.

PS – we believe the basis of our commission, and after four years, we advise that the following management issues be addressed jointly with the ordinance. While you are doing an ordinance, this other track will have to happen.

JS – I'd like to start addressing the ordinance by saying that it's fundamentally upside down. You can't cut the last tree on your property even if it's small. It's punitive to people with more big trees. Would like to say what's wrong and then go to specific issues.

MM – I don't want to get lost in higher level stuff when we want to impact a specific ordinance. I'd like to get the best ordinance we can possibly get. Talking about the bigger picture issues we might be losing our political edge.

PS – the letter would frame up the bigger issue and then go into the details.

JS- support why the 24" diameter as a threshold is inadequate...

SEND A DOODLE POLL TO FIND OUT WHO CAN WORK ON THIS. MAX FOUR COMMISSIONERS. AND TWO SETS OF TIMES.

MM – if people can read the Portland ordinance. 250 pages but readable. Would like to finish reading it and then apply it to a specific Seattle lot to see what would happen and then run it through the Seattle ordinance. Their ordinance won't come into effect until next year.

Adjourn

Community comment:

From: John O'Neil [mailto:JrOneil@seaprep.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2012 12:09 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: FW: Seattle Prep Delmar Site

As one of the Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator, I thought the attached might be of interest.

I have also attached a copy of a brief summary of the site.

If you have any thoughts, please let me know.

Thank you for your time.

John O'Neil
206.552.1007

From: John O'Neil
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2012 8:46 AM
To: 'Kari Olson'; elisabethrubicava@gmail.com; Jennifer Ott; Becca Aue; Jodi Green; valerie.kinast@seattle.gov; jackt@urbansparks.org
Cc: Lionel Job; Rainer M.
Subject: RE: Seattle Prep Delmar Site

I am sorry I did not get back to you yesterday.

We have continued to try to work with the State. At this point, the State has indicated that they do not want to buy our site. While we remain open to the purchase by the State, we do need to move forward with our plans to sell the site.

I have spoken with Forterra but they were not interested in the project. I am trying to find others that might be interested. We welcome any other suggestions.

The following is a copy of the posting in the Montlaker Blog submitted yesterday by Kent Hickey, the President of Prep to clarify some of the statements made by others (his posting is in response to a previous posting by others though not attached):

“This posting (previous posting by others) does not completely capture the communications Prep had with the state about the property we own between Delmar and Boyer. We had contacted the state some time ago to let it know that we were exploring possible uses for this property. We asked the state if it had an interest in incorporating this property within its vision for the 520 design as a beautiful pocket park that would include an ADA accessible path between Delmar and Boyer (Portage Bay). This pocket park could also accommodate a spur that would provide a terrific connection for bicycles between capitol hill and the eastside via the 520. Our thought was that these possible uses would be of great benefit to the state, Prep and our neighbors. They would represent a sustainable, responsible use of this undeveloped property, thus providing for the common good as well.

Simply put, the state did not respond enthusiastically to these possibilities. Further, the discussions never approached the level of a potential deal. At one point the state did include a swap of our property for the mostly useless land under the 520 in one of its drawings. We immediately informed the state that we had no interest in such a swap; the relative values of these properties are not comparable and useless land under a freeway is of no value to us.

We are disappointed in the state’s most recent vision for the west side of the 520 because its short-sightedness evinces a profound lack of vision. Our property is a significant undeveloped green space that could carry wonderful benefits for the community and support alternative means of transportation through incorporation of the bike spur. However, we are certainly in no position to argue the point with the state and do not plan to do so. We have shared our thoughts; the state has indicated it has no interest in them, which is certainly the prerogative of the state.

We appreciated the state’s candor and clear communication that it has no interest in our property and the uses we had proposed. Our plan is to now go back to where we were before our informal discussions with the state; we are exploring potential uses for our Delmar property.

Kent Hickey
President
Seattle Preparatory School

From: Kari Olson [<mailto:olsonka@live.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2012 12:58 PM
To: John O'Neil; elisabethrubalcava@gmail.com; Jennifer Ott; Becca Aue; Jodi Green; valerie.kinast@seattle.gov; jackt@urbansparks.org
Cc: Lionel Job; Rainer M.
Subject: RE: Seattle Prep Delmar Site

John,
we take it then Sea Prep is in a hurry to dispose of property? Has Sea Prep considered a conservation easement with Foreterra (formally Cascade land Conservancy), wherein land is forever preserved as open space - urban forest - multi use pedestrian/bike usage...Sea Prep would negotiate contingencies with Foreterra wherein all parties involved comes away in a win win situation forfeit minimal cost differentials.

Kari

From: JrOneil@seaprep.org
To: olsonka@live.com; elisabethrubalcava@gmail.com; jenniferott@earthlink.net;
becca@seattleparksfoundation.org; jodigreen@mhalperin.com; Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov;
jackt@UrbanSparks.org
CC: lnljob@gmail.com; rnr@montlaker.com

Subject: Seattle Prep Delmar Site

Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2012 18:12:32 +0000

Despite our best intentions, we have been unable to convince the State to purchase the Seattle Prep Delmar site. We thought we were headed in the right direction.

We do not have the resources to properly develop the site. We plan to complete the appraisal and look for a potential buyer.

John O'Neil
206.552.1007

The Purchase of the Seattle Prep Delmar Property between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Ave East

The SR-520 project is a very important project. Equally important is creating a unified plan of all the Parks within the Montlake/Portage Bay/Roanoke/North Capitol Hill communities. We see SR-520 as the catalysis to get it all started. Seattle Prep has a 4 acre piece of property that can help fill the gap.

The Seattle Prep Delmar property is located at the intersection of the North Capitol, Roanoke/Portage Bay and Montlake communities. The property is south of East Delmar, north of 520 and west of Boyer. The center of the property is at the intersection of Delmar and Interlaken. This site represents an extension of the Interlaken Park and the Olmstead plan that goes all the way to Seward Park.

The Prep site is the "missing link" (to quote a Roanoke resident) between Roanoke Park and Seward Park. There is Park Property on both sides of Delmar that borders the Prep site. The Prep site is situated directly below the Bagley Viewpoint expansion that is part of the SR-520 project. The State has proposed a new lid between Delmar, 10th East and Roanoke Park as part of the SR-520 project as well. The Prep property can enhance the open space that will be created by the Delmar Lid and the expansion and renovation of the Bagley Viewpoint that is the State's obligation.

The State has committed to build an accessible ramp from Delmar to Boyer. To the east of Boyer, the State has committed a new viewpoint and open space to Portage Bay. The accessible ramp will link Roanoke Park to this new viewpoint at Boyer. The State is now proposing a ped/bike path along the South side of the Portage Bay Viaduct. The Prep property should be used to provide a natural slope to the new bike path and a more natural path for the accessible ramp. The remaining portion of the Property should be preserved as open spaces in the public domain to allow a complete design to connect the City parks throughout the Neighborhood.

Two Blocks to the South will be the Portage Bay Boardwalk that connects E. Everett Street to the Bill Dawson Trail on the East side of Montlake Park. The Prep site allows Pedestrians to have a safe, accessible walk through Green Spaces from Boylston to basically Seward Park. If the Prep site is not purchase, the only accessible route from the Delmar Lid to the Montlake Park is down Delmar Drive East.

There is a lot of support to bring the Prep Site into the public domain. Groups include: Seattle Parks Foundation, Friend's of Seattle Olmstead Parks, Friends of Interlaken/Boren Parks, Cascade Bicycle Club, Seattle School District, the Montlake Elementary PTA, Montlake/Portage Bay/Roanoke/North Capitol Hill Communities and the Montlake Greenways Project.

From: Michael Oxman [mailto:michaeloxman@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, July 29, 2012 3:02 PM

To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra

Subject: Comment to UFC on proposal

Dear Urban Forestry Commission,

The answer to the question of whether the new tree regulation proposal would be effective, is whether it would protect typical development scenarios that are on the drawing board.

One such scenario is Project #3009986. This is known as the Mapes Creek project, which would build a 30 unit subdivision in a native forest adjacent to Kubota Garden in the Rainier Beach neighborhood of southeast Seattle.

The project has not broken ground, and is currently under a SEPA State Environmental Policy Act Appeal to be heard August 6th by the Seattle Hearing Examiner. The Appeal asks for a hydrogeology report to be submitted prior to zoning approval. This report was requested 3 times by the Seattle Parks Department: in 2010; in 2011; and again in 2012. Later in 2012, the DPD issued a DNS Determination Of Non Significance, without information the report would provide on how storm water flow control and water quality treatment facilities would be handled. The blueprints show a large tank buried under the foot of the asphalt driveway, which slopes steeply (greater than 40%) downhill 30 feet in elevation from the street. An Exceptional Tree Grove slopes downhill another 30' in elevation to the Wetland Buffer.

This grove of a dozen Bigleaf Maple Trees qualifies as Exceptional under the current tree ordinance. There are also 9 other species of smaller trees, including natives such as Cedar, Alder, and Hazelnut, along with exotic tree species that were planted by a former resident like Goldenchain, Pear, Plum, Cherry, Mountain Ash, and Horsechestnut.

Here's where the 'spin' comes in. The process of drilling test wells to determine groundwater characteristics is expensive. The ploy is to de-emphasize the biological complexity of the site using consultants reports. The developer's arborist report states that the site is a 'bigleaf maple monoculture with 1 cedar' in spite of the diversity of 10 species of trees. The city's development regulates 'habitat', but none of the shrubs & groundcovers besides Ivy & blackberry are mentioned. The coyote den isn't mentioned. Offsite features aren't mentioned, such as the fact that the abutting Kubota Garden has an active Coopers Hawk nest with 4 chicks, and has been designated as both a Historic Landmark and a Heritage Tree Grove.

But the real thing the tree grove protects is the wetland & creek buffers that sits partially under the dripline of of the maples. If the impacts of the development causes the wetlands to dry up, or causes Mapes Creek to overflow during peak storms, permanent irreparable damage such as erosion and siltation of the ponds could affect Kubota Garden, which was built in 1927.

So the answer to the question of whether we should roll back our tree protection regulations is unequivacably, "NO!". This project proves it.

Arboreally yours,

Michael Oxman
(206) 949-8733
www.treedr.com

----- Original Message -----

From: [Donna Kostka](#)

To: [Miller, David](#) ; [Oxman, Michael](#) ; [Zemke, Steve](#) ; [Turnbull, Cass](#) ; [Richard Ellison](#)

Cc: [Kay Shoudy](#)

Sent: Sunday, July 29, 2012 10:44 AM

Subject: Please help HHH tree grove idea

All: The HHH tree committee would really not like to see groves get eliminated from Seattle's tree ordinance. The grove concept gives protection to the kind of cover our heron colony needs, too. So, we have come up with a tree grove idea that still could use some fleshing out before we present it to the city. Would you please take a look and help us finalize the idea?

1. The new Seattle tree ordinance would allow protection of groves of three or more trees, if nominated and approved
2. Groves would be nominated by private land owners or by groups with stewardship over public land. Nominations would be accompanied by a nominal nomination fee to pay for City costs, say \$25 per tree.
3. The City would notify other owners within XXX distance of the proposed designated grove. If no objections were received within XXX days, the nomination would become final with the grove listed by the city under the owner's name, i.e. "Smith Family Memorial Grove." If objections, the City would organize a public meeting to air differences and facilitate a decision.
4. The City would notify King County of this listing, and it would be entered as a covenant on the property deed: property contains (number and species) of trees that are a designated tree grove named the "Smith Family Memorial Grove" and may not be cut unless certified diseased or dangerous by a minimum of two certified arborists.

Not included in our idea is what to do about replacement trees when the trees become too old and diseased and dangerous. Not included also is anything about the family getting any tax advantage for declaring a grove. And not included is how to enforce the no-cutting of these groves.

However, we think there are families that value their trees that would be willing to forego dividing their property up for development for the idea of saving their grove and getting their family name on it as a memorial.

Please send your thoughts. Many thanks in advance. Donna (for HHH)

Donna Kostka
Tree Committee
Heron Habitat Helpers
6516A 24th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 283-7805
donna4510@comcast.net

From: Maximilian M Dixon [mailto:maxdixon@uw.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:09 PM
To: Staley, Brennon; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra; Bagshaw, Sally; Burgess, Tim; Clark, Sally; Conlin, Richard; Godden, Jean; Harrell, Bruce; Licata, Nick; O'Brien, Mike; Rasmussen, Tom
Subject: I wholeheartedly support strengthening our tree ordinance!

Mayor McGinn,

Why do we have the weakest tree ordinance of any local municipality? It's appalling!

As a long-time volunteer at local parks involving habitat enhancement and of course tree planting, I wholeheartedly support **strengthening** our tree ordinance. It is a vital component for not only maintaining city tree canopy coverage, but also increasing it. Without an adequate tree ordinance we continue to lose the battle of protecting and increasing our urban forests. Also it takes generations for newly planted trees to provide the amount of water and air filtration, water retention, and CO2 uptake that mature trees do. By protecting more of our mature trees and urban forests we have a greater impact overall. Street trees alone are not enough. Their average lifespan is only 30 years!

As a graduate student at the University of Washington in Urban Planning and Infrastructure Planning & Management I firmly believe Green Infrastructure (trees) is absolutely essential for making our built environments sustainable and resilient. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Maximilian Dixon

Graduate Student, University of Washington (Masters in Urban Planning and Infrastructure Planning & Management)
Board Member and Founding Member, Friends of North Creek Forest
Vice President and Co-Founder, Shoreline Farmers Market Association
Past President and Founder, Sustainability Organization of UWB/CCC

14027 Stone Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133
maxdixon@uw.edu
(206) 393-8889

Cc: Brennan Staley, Sandra Pinto De Bader, Sally Bagshaw, Tim Burgess, Sally Clark, Richard Conlin, Jean Godden, Bruce Harrell, Nick Licata, Mike O'Brien, Tom Rasmussen

From: RICHARD ELLISON [mailto:richard_ellison@hotmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 1:26 AM

To: Deehr, Rebecca

Cc: Donna HeronHH; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra; conservatondirector@seattleaudubon.org; Steve Zemeke; michael oxman

Subject: Herons and Comments on the City of Seattle Revised Draft Tree Regulations

Hello Rebecca,

We chatted briefly at the end of the Urban Forestry Commission (UFC) meeting with Mayor McGuinn about a week ago.

I wanted to discuss the lack of follow through regarding the UFC's proposal to protect Heron rookeries in a Director's Rule update. It died somewhere in DPD, and this wrongs both the community and UFC.

<http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/docs/Final%20issued%20docs/Recommendations/ADOP TED%20Heron%20Recommendation%20040710.pdf> (bottom of page).

I am hoping you can follow up on the Heron habitat issues, and the proposed Directors' Rule to protect them can go forward.

Below are also the comments I sent to DPD regarding the draft tree regulations update. My background as a tree and wildlife advocate includes being an Adjunct Professor of environmental science and biology at Seattle community colleges with an MS in Botany, and founder of the advocacy group "Save Seattle's Trees."

Thank you,

Richard Ellison

To: City of Seattle. DPD Brennon Staley. Brennon.Staley@seattle.gov ;

Comments on the City of Seattle Revised Draft Tree Regulations Update Summary July, 2012

From: Richard Ellison, SaveSeattlesTrees.org, 8003 28th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98115

Date: July 31, 2012

1. **Tree groves must remain protected.**
2. **The threshold for retention should be 12" deciduous, 8" evergreen** (broadleaf and needle). The current DPD thresholds varied by species because some tree species, like native Madrones, do not mature to the 24" DBH required by the proposal. There are many species, as discussed by tree expert Arthur Lee Jacobson to the City Council, where state and local Champion trees (largest in the area) will never grow to 24" but still deserve protection. The City needs a mechanism to protect Champion trees from all development.
3. **Heritage trees (as designated by the City) should be protected**, regardless of location on a lot, unless they become a hazard tree and cannot be pruned sufficiently for safety.
4. **The Seattle City Comprehensive Plan calls for Seattle to be a "Leader in Environmental Stewardship" and that 1 of its 4 core values is Environmental Stewardship.** It continues "E21 Strive to protect and retain certain trees and groups of trees that enhance Seattle's historical, cultural, environmental and aesthetic character." The proposed plan does not provide a means to protect Seattle's historical trees, culturally important trees, and trees deemed "aesthetic" by neighborhoods.
5. **Special wildlife habitat areas** (like Heron Rookeries in the Kiwanis Heron Management Area) require year-round permanent protection, which are not provided by the proposed ordinance. Why has the City not responded to the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission's petition to change the Director's rule to protect Heron habitat?
6. **Cavity nesting bird species** do require larger diameter trees, and protection of trees >24" helps these species. However, allowances should be made in the proposed ordinance to protect wildlife trees from development if they are active and in the proposed footprint of a building.
7. All big tree removals will require the use of a professional tree service, so it is not a burden for a homeowner to use a service with **an ISA certified arborist** to evaluate tree health prior to tree removal.
8. **It's still "open season" to allow all trees < 24" DBH to be removed without permits.** It is wrong that on my property in Wedgwood, which has 5 large Birches and an 22" DBH Incense Cedar, no trees would be protected under the proposed ordinance nor permit required to clear-cut my own property.
9. **The data from the City Arborist's office of street trees finds only 1% > 30" DBH and 6% 18 - 30" DBH.** The data DPD presents stating trees ≥ 24 " represent 14% of Seattle's trees seems out of place in the determining threshold factor in tree protection.
10. **Developers should be given required options about saving healthy smaller diameter trees if a big tree cannot be saved.** For example, the "Big Red" cedar in the Roosevelt community development was to be saved, but was not in the end protected, and smaller healthy conifers and deciduous trees should have been required to be saved as mitigation.